REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 8, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1-5 were pending, that claims 1-4 have been withdrawn from consideration, and rejected claim 5. Claim 5 has been amended, claims 1-4 have been withdrawn, and no claims are canceled. Thus, in view of the forgoing claim 5 remains pending for reconsideration, which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 5 has been amended to clarify that the holder of securities is identified after the transaction.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Quinlan, U.S. Patent No. 6,748,365 on view of Hawkins, U.S. Patent No. 6,247,000. Quinlan is directed to a system of providing rebates to consumers. Hawkins is directed to a system for automatically matching securities traded among brokers. Claim 5 has been amended. Support for the amendment found on page 14 lines 4-23 of the application. Quinlan and Hawkins taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest "wherein the identifying means identifies a customer who has purchased securities as a real holder of the securities if the customer has already transferred the securities to the customer's own name upon request from a securities company used by the customer to purchase the securities, and wherein the identifying means excludes the customer if the customer has not applied for transfer of the securities, or if the customer's applied transfer has not been completed."

Further, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143. There is no suggestion or motivation to combine the references. Quinlan Column 1 lines 11-13 state: "[t]his invention relates to the redemption of product

marketing rebates, and more specifically to a business method for electronically redeeming product marketing rebates." Hawkins Column 1 lines 26-30 states "The present invention relates generally to a method and system for automatically matching financial transactions that are electronically traded among various user groups, and in particular to a method and device for automatically matching securities electronically traded among brokers." Quinlan therefore, is a system for consumers to redeem rebates. In contrast, Hawkins is a broker to broker stock verification system. There is no motivation to combine a consumer based rebate redemption system with a business to business stock trading verification system.

For at least the reasons stated above, Quinlan and Hawkins taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest the elements of claim.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM

Claim 13 is new. Support for claim 13 found on page 2, line 20 through page 3 line 16 and page 14 lines 4-23 of the application. Quinlan and Hawkins taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest "retrieving information of a completed securities purchase; comparing the completed information of the securities purchased with information in a customer information storage; and identifying a customer as the true owner of the securities, the comparison showing the customer has applied for and completed a transfer of the securities to customer's name by request of the customer's brokerage."

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. It is also submitted that claim 5 continues to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Resubmitted
Date: January 9, 2007

By: /James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501